

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2006

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/679,138	10/03/2003	Tanya L. Niemeyer	59673-52	3651	
22504	22504 7590 11/03/2006		EXAMINER		
	DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP			EVERHART, CARIDAD	
	IRY SQUARE H AVENUE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SEATTLE, V	SEATTLE, WA 98101-1688		2891		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	10	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/679,138	NIEMEYER, TANYA L.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Caridad M. Everhart	2891
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
closed in accordance with the practice under E	х рапе Quayle, 1935 С.D. 11, 48	03 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-32 and 39-44 is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-32,39-44 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the confidence of th	epted or b) objected to by the Idrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this Ńational Stage
Attachment(s)		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate

Application/Control Number: 10/679,138 Page 2

Art Unit: 2891

Response to Arguments

Applicant has argued that Degani describes a system in which all portions of the image are analyzed and colored, and that Degani does not disclose automatic hierarchical analysis. These arguments are respectfully found to be not persuasive for the following reasons. Degani presents an automated analysis which results in the determination of malignant tumors(paragraph 0092 discloses that the apparatus carries out analysis in order to determine the presence of malignant tumor or other result). Paragraphs 0077, 0091, and 0092 disclose that the color intensities and their distributions are analyzed by the apparatus in order to output the results of malignant tumor or other tumor detection. Figure 9 shows that in the assigning of a color to the volume under analysis, there is a hierarchical procedure, as if the assignment is not red, then the next block determines if the color is green, etc. Paragraph 0071 indicates that red indicates fast wash out behavior, which is indicated by red color. Blue indicates fast wash-in, which would correspond to enhancement(paragraph 0065). New rejections in view of the prior art of record are found below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-5,15,16,17,18,28,29,30,31,32, and 39-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Degani (US 2005/0038619A1).

Art Unit: 2891

Degani discloses a method for analyzing MRI contrast images(paragraph 0005 and 0006) and the analysis is done by machine and is a dynamic analysis and is both space and time dependent(paragraph 0005 and 0007). The process is contrast enhanced(paragraph 0011). The initial increase in intensity following the contrast administration is detected (paragraph 0057). Following this, the washout behavior of the tissue volume exhibiting washout behavior is analyzed(paragraph 0069 relates pixels to initial wash-in intensity and paragraph 0051 relates volume to pixel intensity, so that the volume is related to intial behavior in paragraph 0069, and the washout behavior is then analyzed as disclosed in paragraph 0057). The imaging is of the breast(paragraph 0005). Pixels are identified as associated with a malignancy(paragraph 0031), and as cited above, pixels are identified with voxels. Figures 13, 14, and 15 show three types of wash out behavior, with 14 showing plateau and 13 showing enhancement and 15 showing washout. The rate of change of the washout is an important parameter in detecting the malignancy, and the rate of change is the slope(paragraph 0005). The rate of change in signal intensitiy is an important parameter in detecting breast masses(paragraph 0005 and 0056) and an intensity function is calculated(paragraph 0056). The output is in the form of a curve with the intensity points calculated from 3 time points (3TP images) according the the method taught by Degani(Fig. 20). Degani further teaches software, which is computer readable medium for carrying out the calculations described and including the normalization calculations shown in paragraph 0084 (paragraph 0110). Degani also includes the disclosure included above in the response to arguments.

Application/Control Number: 10/679,138

Art Unit: 2891

Degani does not state the term plateau.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that Degani encompasses plateau behaviour because Degani discloses that normal tissue exhibits the behaviour of greater areas of green when wash in and wash out are moderate(paragraph 0106), which would correspond to plateau behaviour.

Claims 6-14, and 19-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Desani as applied to claim 1 above.

Degani is silent with respect to the value of the slope recited and the steps as recited of comparing a slope to a threshold value.

Although Degani is silent with respect to the steps of comparing the slope, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that Degani encompasses this step, as Degani discloses that there is a calibration map(paragraph 0010) that is calculated and therefore that values are compared by the apparatus and that the intensity function is one of the values calculated and therefore a calibration map would be generated for this value(paragraph 0056 and 0071) and that the slope of values are calculated and compared with the calculated value is disclosed by that the rate of change, which is the slope, is one of the parameters that is calculated and compared(paragraph 0070).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have chosen the recited value of the slope because the slope is a variable of the art, as shown by Degani in paragraph 0005 and in Fig. 13, 14, and 15 as cited above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Caridad M. Everhart whose telephone number is 571-272-1892. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Fridays 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, B. Baumeister can be reached on 571-272-1722. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

C. Lueshay

C. Everhart 10-30-2005